

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 30, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner also rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner additionally rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,499,026 ("*Rivette*").

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-8 and 12 to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at page 9, paragraphs [045] and [046].

Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

Rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In rejecting claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Examiner stated that the recited user interface template is not statutory because it is not a computer component or statutory process, as it is not an act being performed. Office Action, page 2. Applicants submit that claims 1-7 have been amended to recite a "user interface," which is a statutory computer component that performs patentable acts. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections of claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 citing insufficient antecedent basis for the recited "content pattern templates." Office Action, page 3.

Applicants submit that claims 5 and 12 have been amended to recite a singular “content pattern template,” which has antecedent basis from claims 4 and 11, respectively.

Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claims 5 and 12 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rivette*. Applicants respectfully submit that *Rivette* does not anticipate the amended independent claims 1 and 8. More specifically, amended claim 1 recites including in the user interface “a first pane displaying two or more view selection links, wherein the selection links are specifically pushed to the user for completing the task required of the user, the first pane having one of the two or more view selection links selected by the user at any point in time.” In this way, the claimed invention “provides information to the user based on tasks and events that the user needs to accomplish or monitor. As a result, the user’s work is simplified. He can spend more time using the computer system to monitor a business situation and less time entering data or attempting to retrieve information needed to make decisions.” Applicants’ specification, page 9, paragraph [046].

Rivette fails to show or suggest the above claimed feature. More specifically, *Rivette*, in the section cited by the Examiner, merely shows displaying a pane containing a list of links to various patent numbers. Col. 114, lines 23-33. Neither the cited section or any other section of *Rivette* describes or suggest the specific action of “displaying two or more view selection links, wherein the selection links are specifically pushed to the user for completing the task required of the user,” as recited in amended

claim 1. Therefore, at least because *Rivette* fails to show or suggest the above limitation of amended claim 1, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Rivette* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Amended claim 8 includes a similar limitation as discussed above in connection with claim 1 and is, therefore, also not anticipated by *Rivette* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14, depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are, therefore, additionally allowable over *Rivette* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 10, 2007

By: 
Cathy C. Ding
Reg. No. 52,820